arXiv:1411.6489v1 [math.RT] 24 Nov 2014

Block-diagonalization of matrices over local rings II.

Dmitry Kerner

Abstract. Consider rectangular matrices over a local ring R. In the previous work we have obtained criteria for block-diagonalization of such matrices, i.e. $UAV = A_1 \oplus A_2$, where U, V are invertible matrices over R. In this short note we extend the criteria to the decomposability of quiver representations over R.

1. Introduction

This work is the continuation of [Kerner-Vinnikov].

1.1. **Setup.** Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local (commutative, associative) ring over a field $\Bbbk$ of characteristic 0. As the simplest examples one can consider *regular* rings, e.g. formal power series, $\Bbbk[[x_1, \dots, x_p]]$, rational functions that are regular at the origin, $\Bbbk[x_1, .., x_p]_{(\mathfrak{m})}$, convergent power series, $k\{x_1, .., x_p\}$, when $\Bbbk$ is a normed field. (If $\Bbbk = \mathbb{R}$ or $\Bbbk = \mathbb{C}$, one can consider the rings of germs of continuous or smooth functions as well.) Usually we assume the ring to be non-Artinian, i.e. of positive Krull dimension (though R can be not pure dimensional).

Denote by $Mat(m, n; R)$ the set of matrices with entries in R. In this paper we always assume: $1 < m \leq n$. Usually we assume that the matrices "vanish at the origin", $A|_0 = \mathbb{O}$, i.e. $A \in Mat(m, n; \mathfrak{m})$. Various matrix equivalences are important.

• In commutative algebra matrices are considered up to the left-right equivalence, $A \overset{G_{lr}}{\sim} UAV$, where $(U, V) \in G_{lr} := GL(m, R) \times GL(n, R)$.

• In representation theory (of algebras/groups) the matrices are considered up to the conjugation, $A \overset{G_{conj}}{\sim} UAU^{-1}$, $U \in GL(m, R)$.

• For the study of bilinear/quadratic/skew-symmetric forms one considers the congruence, $A \overset{G_{congr}}{\sim} UAU^T$, $U \in GL(n, R)$. (Note that we consider the non-primitive forms, i.e. A vanishes mod $\mathfrak{m}$.)

• More generally, one studies the matrix problems/representations of quivers. Each such representation consists of a collection of (rectangular) matrices and a prescribed transformation equivalence.

Unlike the case of classical linear algebra (over a field), the matrices over a ring cannot be diagonalized or brought to some nice/simple/canonical form. For a given group action $G \circlearrowright Mat(m, n; R)$ the natural weaker question is the decomposability:

$$\text{(1)} \qquad \textit{Which matrices are block-diagonalizable, i.e. } A \overset{G}{\sim} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & A_2 \end{pmatrix} ?$$

In [Kerner-Vinnikov] we have addressed this question for G_{lr}-equivalence. Recall that the Fitting ideals (the ideals of $j \times j$ minors, $\{I_j(A)\}$) are invariant under G_{lr}-equivalence, [Eisenbud-book, §20]. Thus the ideal of maximal minors of a block-diagonalizable matrix necessarily factorizes: $I_m(A) = I_{m_1}(A_1) I_{m_2}(A_2)$. We have obtained the following necessary and sufficient conditions for block-diagonalizability.

Theorem 2. *1.* [Kerner-Vinnikov, Theorem 2] *(the case of square matrices)*
Let $A \in Mat(m, m; \mathfrak{m})$, $m > 1$, with $\det(A) = f_1 f_2$. Suppose each $f_i \in R$ is neither invertible nor a zero divisor and f_1, f_2 are relatively prime, i.e. $(f_1) \cap (f_2) = (f_1 f_2)$. Then $A \overset{G_{lr}}{\sim} A_1 \oplus A_2$, with

Date: November 25, 2014.
I was supported by the grant FP7-People-MCA-CIG, 334347.

$\det(A_i) = f_i$ *iff* $I_{m-1}(A) \subseteq (f_1) + (f_2) \subset R$.
2. [Kerner-Vinnikov, Theorem 4] *(the case of rectangular matrices)*
Let $A \in Mat(m, n; \mathfrak{m})$, $m \leq n$. *Suppose the ideal* $I_m(A)$ *does not annihilate any non-zero element of* R, *i.e.* $ann_R(I_m(A)) = \{0\}$. *Suppose further that* $ker(A) \subseteq I_m(A)R^{\oplus n}$. *Suppose* $I_m(A) = J_1 J_2$, *where the (nontrivial) ideals* $J_1, J_2 \subset R$ *are mutually prime, i.e.* $J_1 \cap J_2 = J_1 J_2$. *Then* $A \overset{G_{lr}}{\sim} A_1 \oplus A_2$ *with* $I_{m_i}(A_i) = J_i$ *iff* $I_{m-1}(A) \subseteq (J_1 + J_2) \subset R$.

(In the second case, when speaking of $ker(A)$, we consider A as the map of free modules $R^{\oplus n} \overset{A}{\to} R^{\oplus m}$. The condition $ker(A) \subseteq I_m(A)R^{\oplus n}$ is the genericity assumption.)

In this short note we extend the decomposability criteria to other equivalences. More precisely, we reduce the decomposability of quiver representations to the decomposability of matrices under G_{lr}-equivalence. This reduction comes at the expense of enlarging the ring. However theorem 2 is "insensitive" to the dimension of the ring. Thus the theorem can be used effectively to obtain explicit decomposability criteria for various quivers/matrix problems.

2. Quiver representations over local rings

Given a quiver Q with the set of vertices I. A representation of Q over a ring R is the collection of R-modules, $\{M_i\}_{i\in I}$ and of their morphisms $M_j \overset{A_{ij}}{\to} M_i$.

The following elementary observation is frequently used. Given a ring R, consider the formal extension by some new variables, $R[[\{x_i\}]]$. Given two matrices, A, B over $R[[\{x_i\}]]$ whose entries are linear in $\{x_i\}$, i.e. $A = \sum_i x_i A_i$ for some matrices A_i over R. If $A = \tilde{U}B\tilde{V}$, where $\tilde{U}$, $\tilde{V}$ are invertible, with entries in $R[[\{x_i\}]]$, then there exist invertible matrices U, V, over R, satisfying $A = UBV$. This leads to:

Proposition 3. *Fix a subgroup* $G \subseteq G_{lr}$. *Two tuples of matrices over* R *are simultaneously* G*-equivalent,* $(A_1, \dots, A_N) \overset{G}{\sim} (B_1, \dots, B_N)$, *iff the corresponding matrices* $\sum_i A_i x_i$, $\sum_i B_i x_i$ *are* G*-equivalent (over* $R[[\{x_i\}]]$*).*

We use this property for the groups G_{lr}, G_{conj}, G_{congr}.

2.1. **Replacing the quiver by a complete reduced quiver.** Fix a quiver Q and its representation $\{A_{ij}\}$.
• We can (and will) always assume that for any two vertices (i, j) of Q the quiver has arrows in both directions, $i \leftrightarrows j$. (Add all the missing arrows to the initial quiver and assume that the corresponding morphisms are zeros.)
• We can (and will) assume that there are precisely two arrows: $i \to j$ and $j \to i$. If there are more, e.g. there is a tuple of morphisms $M_i \overset{(A_{ij}^{(1)}, \dots, A_{ij}^{(N)})}{\to} M_j$, then we extend the ring to $R[[\{x_i\}]]$, and replace this tuple by one morphism $\sum_k A_{ij}^{(k)} x_k$. By proposition 3 we get an equivalent problem.

We call the so obtained quiver "a complete reduced" quiver.

2.2. **Embedding the quiver representations into representation of the Kronecker quiver.** Given a complete reduced quiver Q_R, with its representation $\{A_{ij}\}$, over R. Associate to it the following square matrix:

$$\{A_{ij}\}_{1\leq i,j\leq m} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{A}_Q := \begin{pmatrix} x_{11}A_{11} + y_1\mathbb{I} & x_{12}A_{12} & \cdots & x_{1m}A_{1m} \\ x_{21}A_{21} & x_{22}A_{22} + y_2\mathbb{I} & x_{23}A_{23} & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ x_{m1}A_{m1} & \cdots & \cdots & x_{mm}A_{mm} + y_m\mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

Here $\{x_{ij}\}$ and $\{y_i\}$ are some new formal variables (so that $\mathcal{A}_Q$ is linear in these variables), while $\mathbb{I}$ denote the identity matrices of the appropriate sizes. We consider $\mathcal{A}_Q$ as a representation of the Kronecker quiver over $R[[\{x_{ij}\},\{y_i\}]]$.

Proposition 5. *Two quiver representations $\{A_{ij}\}$, $\{B_{ij}\}$ are equivalent (over R) iff the corresponding matrices $\mathcal{A}_Q$ and $\mathcal{B}_Q$ are G_{lr}-equivalent (over $R[[\{x_{ij}\},\{y_i\}]]$).*

Apparently this embedding is well known but we know the reference only for the particular case of conjugation, when Q has just one vertex and one arrow, e.g. [Rao, §8].

Proof. $\Rrightarrow$ The equivalence of representations means $A_{ij} = U_i B_{ij} U_j^{-1}$, for some matrices $\{U_i \in GL(m_i,R)\}$. Therefore $\begin{pmatrix} U_1 & \mathbb{O} & \cdots \\ \cdots & & \cdots \\ \mathbb{O} & \cdots & U_m \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_Q \begin{pmatrix} U_1^{-1} & \mathbb{O} & \cdots \\ \cdots & & \cdots \\ \mathbb{O} & \cdots & U_m^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{B}_Q$.

$\Lleftarrow$ Suppose $\mathcal{B} = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}\mathcal{A}_Q\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{U}},\tilde{\mathcal{V}} \in GL(\sum\limits_i m_i, R[[\{x_{ij}\},\{y_i\}]])$. Recall that $\mathcal{B}_Q$, $\mathcal{A}_Q$ are linear in $\{x_{ij}\},\{y_i\}$. Thus, by proposition 3, we can choose invertible matrices $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{V}$ over R satisfying $\mathcal{B}_Q = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}_Q\mathcal{V}$. In the later equality consider the y_i parts for each i. In particular, put $y_1 = \cdots = y_m$ to get $\mathcal{U}\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{I}$. Now consider each y_i separately to get: $\mathcal{U} = \bigoplus\limits_i U_i$, $\mathcal{V} = \bigoplus\limits_i U_i^{-1}$. Therefore $(\bigoplus\limits_i U_i)\mathcal{A}_Q(\bigoplus\limits_i U_i^{-1}) = \mathcal{B}_Q$. This implies $U_i A_{ij} U_{ij}^{-1} = B_{ij}$. ∎

2.3. Decomposability of $\{A_{ij}\}$ vs decomposability of $\mathcal{A}_Q$.

Definition 6. *$\mathcal{A}_Q$ is quiver-block-diagonalizable if $\mathcal{A}_Q \overset{G_{lr}}{\sim} \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$, where each of the determinants $det(\mathcal{A}_k)$ contains a monomial $\prod\limits_{i=1}^{m} y_i^{l_i}$, where $0 < l_i < m_i$.*

Proposition 7. *The representation $\{A_{ij}\}$ is decomposable iff the matrix $\mathcal{A}_Q$ is quiver-block-diagonalizable.*

Proof. $\Rrightarrow$ Suppose $\{A_{ij}\}$ is (non-trivially) decomposable, i.e. $\{U_i A_{ij} U_j^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{ij}^{(1)} & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & A_{ij}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}\}$. Denote $\mathcal{U} = \oplus U_i$. Then $\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}_Q\mathcal{U}^{-1}$ consists of blocks, the ij'th block being $\begin{pmatrix} A_{ij}^{(1)} + \delta_{ij} y_i \mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & A_{ij}^{(2)} + \delta_{ij} y_i \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}$. (Here $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and 0 if $i \neq j$.) Note that each matrix $y_i\mathbb{I}$ is of non-zero size.

Then, by row/column permutations one can bring $\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}_Q\mathcal{U}^{-1}$ to the form $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$, where each $\mathcal{A}_k$ consists of blocks $A_{ij}^{(k)} + \delta_{ij} y_i \mathbb{I}$. As each block $y_i\mathbb{I}$ is of non-zero size, $det(\mathcal{A}_k)$ contains the monomial $\prod\limits_{i=1}^{m} y_i^{l_i}$ with $0 < l_i$.

$\Lleftarrow$ Consider the images of $\mathcal{A}_k$ under the projection $R \xrightarrow{\phi} R/\{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\phi(\mathcal{A}_Q)$ is diagonal and its entries are linear in $\{y_i\}$, $\phi(\mathcal{A}) = \oplus y_i C_i$ and $\sum rank(C_i) = rank(\mathcal{A}_Q)$. Thus we can assume that the entries of each diagonal matrix $\phi(\mathcal{A}_k)$ are linear in $\{y_i\}$ and the similar rank decomposition holds: $\phi(\mathcal{A}_k) = \oplus y_i C_i^{(k)}$. Now $\phi(\mathcal{A}_Q)$ and $\phi(\mathcal{A}_1) \oplus \phi(\mathcal{A}_2)$ are related by row/column permutations. Fix the corresponding matrices U, V, over $\Bbbk$, such that $U\phi(\mathcal{A}_Q)V^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(\mathcal{A}_1) & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & \phi(\mathcal{A}_2) \end{pmatrix}$.

Using the embedding $\Bbbk \hookrightarrow R$ consider U, V as matrices over R. Consider the matrix $U^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & \mathcal{A}_2 \end{pmatrix} V$. It is of the form $\begin{pmatrix} y_1\mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} & \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \mathbb{O} & & y_m\mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} + \mathbb{X}$, where the block structure of $\mathbb{X}$ is: $\mathbb{X}_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{X}_{ij}^{(1)} & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & \mathbb{X}_{ij}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$ with

$size(\mathbb{X}^{(k)}_{ij}) = size(C^{(k)}_i)$. Thus the matrix $U^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{A}_1 & \mathbb{O}\\ \mathbb{O} & \mathcal{A}_2\end{pmatrix}V$ comes from a decomposable representaton of the initial quiver. Now, invoke proposition 5 to get: $\{A_{ij}\}$ is decomposable. ∎
Combining this result with theorem 2 we get:

Corollary 8. *1. If the representation $\{A_{ij}\}$ is decomposable then $det(\mathcal{A}) \in R[[\{x_{ij}\},\{y_i\}]]$ is reducible. 2. Suppose $det(\mathcal{A}) = f_1 f_2$, where each of f_1, f_2 is a non-zero divisor and contains a monomial $\prod_i y_i^{l_i}$. Suppose they are relatively prime, i.e. $(f_1)\cap(f_2) = (f_1 f_2)$. Then the representation $\{A_{ij}\}$ is decomposable iff $I_{m-1}(\mathcal{A}) \subset (f_1)+(f_2)$.*

In many examples $\det(\mathcal{A})$ is square free, thus f_1, f_2 are necessarily relatively prime. So, the corollary gives a very simple and effective decomposability criterion.

3. Examples

3.1. **Conjugation.** The conjugation, corresponds to the quiver with just one vertex (and several arrows). Explicitly, we are given a tuple of square matrices up to the simultaneous conjugation, $(A_1,\dots,A_m) \to U(A_1,\dots,A_m)U^{-1}$. Introduce the new variables, $x_1,\dots,x_m,\ y$. The associated matrix is $\mathcal{A}_Q = \sum_i x_i A_i + y\mathbb{1}$. So that $\{A_i\}\sim\{B_i\}$ iff $\mathcal{A}_Q \sim \mathcal{B}_Q$. Proposition 7 reads:

(9)
the representation $\{A_i\}$ is G_{conj}-decomposable iff $\mathcal{A}_Q = \sum_i x_i A_i + y\mathbb{1}$ is G_{lr}-block-diagonalizable.

As the simplest case consider the 2×2 matrices over R.

Corollary 10. *Given $A = \begin{pmatrix}a_{11} & a_{12}\\ a_{21} & a_{22}\end{pmatrix} \in Mat(2,2;R)$, suppose $tr^2(A) \neq 4det(A)$. Then A is G_{conj}-decomposable iff $tr^2(A) - 4det(A)$ is a full square in R and moreover the elements a_{12}, a_{21}, $(a_{11}-a_{22})$ all belong to the ideal $\left(\sqrt{tr^2(A)-4det(A)}\right)$.*

Proof. We want to check the G_{lr}-decomposability of $xA+y\mathbb{1}$. First of all we get that $det(xA+y\mathbb{1}) = y^2 + xy\cdot tr(A) + x^2\cdot det(A)$ must factor over $R[[y]]$. Consider this as a quadratic equation for y. The roots are $y_\pm = x\frac{-tr(A)\pm\sqrt{tr^2(A)-4det(A)}}{2}$. Thus $tr^2(A)-4det(A)$ must be a full square in R.

To use theorem 2 we want the factors $(y-y_-)$, $(y-y_+)$ of $det(xA+y\mathbb{1})$ to be relatively prime. As y, x are independent variables, the factors are relatively prime iff $y_- \neq y_+$, i.e. $tr^2(A)-4det(A)\neq 0$.

Finally, if $tr^2(A)-4det(A)\neq 0$, but is a full square in R, then the condition $I_1(xA+y\mathbb{1}) \subseteq J_1+J_2$ reads: $(xa_{12}, xa_{21}, 2y+xtr(A), x(a_{11}-a_{22})) \subseteq (2y+xtr(A), x\sqrt{tr^2(A)-4det(A)})$. Which means $(a_{12},a_{21},a_{11}-a_{22}) \subseteq (\sqrt{tr^2(A)-4det(A)})$. ∎

Example 11. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix}a_{11}x_2 & a_{12}x_1^k\\ a_{21}x_1^l & a_{22}x_2\end{pmatrix}$, where $0\neq a_{ij}\in\Bbbk$ and $\Bbbk = \bar{\Bbbk}$ and x_1, x_2 are algebraically independent. Then $tr^2(A)-4det(A) = (a_{11}-a_{22})^2x_2^2 + a_{12}a_{21}x_1^{k+l}$. If this expression is a full square then either $a_{11}=a_{22}$ and $k+l\in 2\mathbb{Z}$ or $a_{12}a_{21}=0$.
• Suppose $a_{11}=a_{22}$ and $k+l\in 2\mathbb{Z}$. To ensure $tr^2(A)-4det(A)\neq 0$ we assume $a_{11}a_{22}\neq 0$. Then the condition $\{a_{12}x_1^k, a_{21}x_1^l\} \subset (\sqrt{a_{12}a_{21}x_1^{k+l}})$ means: $k=l$.
• Suppose $a_{12}a_{21}=0$. Then the condition $\{a_{12}x_1^k, a_{21}x_1^l, (a_{11}-a_{22})x_2\} \subset ((a_{11}-a_{22})x_2)$ means: $a_{12}=a_{21}=0$, i.e. A is already diagonal.
• Finally, if $a_{11}=a_{22}=0$, but $a_{12}a_{21}\neq 0$ then the matrix is not G_{conj}-diagonalizable, e.g. by checking the characteristic polynomial.

Summarizing: if A is not diagonal then it is G_{conj}-diagonalizable iff $k=l$, $a_{11}=a_{22}=1$.

Example 12. Similarly consider $A = \begin{pmatrix} x_2 & x_1^k & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 & x_1^l \\ -x_1^{3n-k-l} & 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $det(A) = (x_2 - x_1^n)(x_2^2 + x_2x_1^n + x_1^{2n})$, note that the two factors are mutually prime. Thus the G_{lr}-decomposability holds iff $k = l = n$. To check the G_{conj}-decomposability we consider $\mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} y + x_2 & x_1^n & 0 \\ 0 & y + x_2 & x_1^n \\ -x_1^n & 0 & y + x_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $I_2(\mathcal{A}) = (y + x_2)^2 + ((y + x_2)x_1^n) + (x_1^{2n}) \subseteq (x_2 - x_1^n) + (x_2^2 + x_2x_1^n + x_1^{2n})$. Thus A is G_{conj}-decomposable.

3.2. **The "star" quiver.** Consider the one-vertex quiver, with l incoming arrows and m outgoing arrows, $Q = \begin{matrix} & & A_{1+1} \nwarrow\uparrow\nearrow A_k \\ & \bullet \circlearrowleft C & \\ B_1 \nearrow\uparrow\nwarrow B_l & & \end{matrix}$. The corresponding matrix is

$$\mathcal{A}_Q = \begin{pmatrix} x_{00}C + y_0\mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} & \dots & \mathbb{O} & x_{0,l+1}A_{l+1} & \dots & x_{0,k}A_k \\ x_{10}B_1 & y_1\mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} & & & & \\ \dots & & & \dots & & & \\ x_{l0}B_l & \mathbb{O} & \dots & y_l\mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} & \dots & \\ \mathbb{O} & \dots & \dots & \mathbb{O} & y_{l+1}\mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} & \\ \dots & & & & & \dots & y_k\mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

Here $det(\mathcal{A}_Q) = det(x_{00}C + y_0\mathbb{I}) \prod_{i=1}^{k} y_i^{m_i}$, so any factorization $det(\mathcal{A}_Q) = f_1f_2$ is impossible with f_1, f_2 relatively prime. Theorem 2 does not produce any decomposability criterion here.

3.2.1. *The string quiver.* Consider the quiver $Q = \bullet \underset{B_1}{\overset{A_1}{\leftrightarrows}} \bullet \cdots \bullet \cdots \bullet \underset{B_{m-1}}{\overset{A_{m-1}}{\leftrightarrows}} \bullet$. The corresponding matrix is:

$$\mathcal{A}_Q = \begin{pmatrix} y_1\mathbb{I} & x_{12}A_1 & \mathbb{O} & \dots & \mathbb{O} \\ x_{21}B_1 & y_2\mathbb{I} & x_{23}A_2 & \mathbb{O} & \\ \mathbb{O} & x_{32}B_2 & y_3\mathbb{I} & x_{34}A_3 & \mathbb{O} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & x_{m-1,m}A_{m-1} \\ \mathbb{O} & \dots & \mathbb{O} & x_{m,m-1}B_{m-1} & y_m\mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} \tag{14}$$

The decomposability of a representation of Q is controlled by $\mathcal{A}_Q$.

Example 15. Consider the simplest case, $Q = \bullet \underset{B}{\overset{A}{\leftrightarrows}} \bullet$, where $A, B \in Mat(2, 2; R)$. Then $\det \mathcal{A}_Q = y_1^2y_2^2 - y_1y_2x_{12}x_{21}tr(AB) + x_{12}^2x_{21}^2det(AB)$. Thus the decomposability implies: $tr^2(AB) - 4det(AB)$ is a full square in R. Further, if $\mathcal{A}_Q$ is decomposable then the generators of $I_3(\mathcal{A}_Q)$, i.e. the elements

$$y_1y_2^2,\ y_1^2y_2,\ \{y_1y_2x_{12}A_{ij}\},\ \{y_1y_2x_{21}B_{ij}\},\ x_{12}^2x_{21}det(A)\{B_{ij}\},\ x_{12}x_{21}^2det(B)\{A_{ij}\} \tag{16}$$

belong to the ideal: $(2y_1y_2 - x_{12}x_{21}tr(AB)) + \left(x_{12}x_{21}\sqrt{tr^2(AB) - 4det(AB)}\right)$. As y_1, y_2, x_{12}, x_{21} are algebraically independent, only two cases are possible:

- $tr(AB) = 0$ and the elements $det(A)\{B_{ij}\}$, $det(B)\{A_{ij}\}$ belong to the ideal $(\sqrt{-det(AB)})$. In this case the factors of $\det \mathcal{A}_Q$ are mutually prime iff $det(AB) \neq 0$. If $det(AB) \neq 0$ then theorem 2 ensures decomposability. If $det(AB) = 0$, then the condition on $det(A)\{B_{ij}\}$, $det(B)\{A_{ij}\}$ forces: either $A = \mathbb{O}$ or $B = \mathbb{O}$ or $det(A) = 0 = det(B)$.
- $det(AB) = a \cdot tr^2(AB)$, where $a - \frac{1}{4}$ is invertible in R. Then the factors of $\det \mathcal{A}_Q$ are mutually prime and together generate the ideal $(y_1y_2) + (x_{12}x_{21}tr(AB))$. In this case the conditions give: both $det(A)\{B_{ij}\}$ $det(B)\{A_{ij}\}$ belong to the ideal $(tr(AB))$.

References

[Eisenbud-book] D.Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra. With a view toward algebraic geometry.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 150. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[Kerner-Vinnikov] D. Kerner V. Vinnikov, *Block-diagonalization of matrices over local rings I.*, arXiv:1305.2256.

[Rao] R. Rao, *Structure theorems, Canonical forms over a PID*, http://bprim.org/rarnotes.pdf

[Yoshino-book] Y.Yoshino, *Cohen-Macaulay modules over Cohen-Macaulay rings.* London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 146. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. viii+177 pp.

Department of Mathematics, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, P.O.B. 653, Be'er Sheva 84105, Israel.

E-mail address: dmitry.kerner@gmail.com